From: 8064986673 To: 00215712738300 Page: 8/10 Date: 2005/11/10 下午 03:36:12

Appl. No. 10/605,853 Amdt. dated November 10, 2005 Reply to Office action of August 16, 2005

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### 1. Objection to the specification:

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 2, line 14, 164 should be a "second linear portion". Appropriate correction is required.

# Response:

5

20

25

Paragraph 0005 of the specification has been amended as shown above. Acceptance of the corrected specification is respectfully requested.

# 2. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

#### 15 Response:

Claim 7 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

#### 3. Rejection of claims 1-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Deeg et al (DE 3739272, hereinafter referred to as Deeg).

### Response:

The applicant would like to point out how claim 1 is patentably distinguished from Deeg. In the claimed invention, the transmission belt is fixed to a fastener of the scanning carriage housing at one location and is also attached to a sliding mechanism at another location. An elastic device is connected to the housing at a first end and to the sliding mechanism at a second end.

From: 8064986673 To: 00215712738300 Page: 9/10 Date: 2005/11/10 下午 03:36:13

Appl. No. 10/605,853 Amdt. dated November 10, 2005 Reply to Office action of August 16, 2005

15

20

On the other hand, Deeg (DE 3739272) teaches a different arrangement. Deeg teaches that the transmission belt 19 is only attached to the carriage 7 with clamping device 8. The transmission belt 19 is able to freely move through guidance portion 9 in order to enable to the transmission belt 19 to have the right amount of tension (see column 2, lines 15-33 of Deeg).

Deeg does not teach the following two claimed limitations contained in claim 1:

"a sliding mechanism disposed on the housing and capable of sliding in a linear direction on the housing, the sliding mechanism engaging the transmission belt so that there is no relative displacement between the sliding mechanism and the transmission belt; and

an elastic device fixed to the housing at a first end and fixed to the sliding mechanism at a second end for maintaining proper tension in the transmission belt."

Deeg does not teach a sliding mechanism that engages the transmission belt and is capable of sliding in a linear direction on the housing. In addition, Deeg does not teach that an elastic device is attached to both the housing at a first end and to the sliding mechanism at a second end. For these reasons, Deeg does not teach all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claims 2-6 and 8 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-6 and 8 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

From: 8064986673

To: 00215712738300

Page: 10/10

Date: 2005/11/10 下午 03:36:13

Appl. No. 10/605,853 Amdt. dated November 10, 2005 Reply to Office action of August 16, 2005

Sincerely yours,

Weinton Han

Date: Nov. 10, 2005

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)